arXiv:math/0703258v2 [math.AC] 29 Jun 2007

Arithmetical ranks of Stanley-Reisner ideals via linear algebra[1]

Margherita Barile[2]
Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Bari, Via E. Orabona 4,
70125 Bari, Italy[3]

Abstract We present some examples of squarefree monomial ideals whose arithmetical rank can be computed using linear algebraic considerations.

Keywords: Arithmetical rank, monomial ideals, set-theoretic complete intersections.

Introduction and Preliminaries

The *arithmetical rank* (ara) of an ideal I in a commutative Noetherian ring R is the minimal number s of elements $a_1, \ldots, a_s$ of R such that $\sqrt{I} = \sqrt{(a_1, \ldots, a_s)}$; one can express this equality by saying that $a_1, \ldots, a_s$ *generate* I *up to radical*. In general height $I \leq \operatorname{ara} I$; if equality holds, I is called a *set-theoretic complete intersection*. In this paper we determine the arithmetical ranks of some ideals which, in a polynomial ring over a field, are generated by monomials. Some results in this direction have already been proven in several works of the same author ([1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8]). In this note we study new examples in which the problem cannot be solved by means of the previously known methods; in particular we settle two cases which were left open in [8]. The technique we are going to develop is based on linear algebraic considerations as in [1] and in [2], but here, unlike in those papers, our approach is completely characteristic-free.

Our results are best presented if the ideals are placed in a combinatorial framework. First of all observe that, since the arithmetical rank of any ideal remains unchanged when the latter is replaced by its radical, we can restrict our attention to ideals generated by squarefree monomials. Let X be a finite set of indeterminates over the field K. A *simplicial complex* on X is a set Δ of subsets of X such that for all $x \in X$, $\{x\} \in \Delta$ and whenever $F \in \Delta$ and $G \subset F$, then $G \in \Delta$. The elements of Δ are called *faces*, whereas X is called the *vertex set* of Δ, and the elements of X are called the *vertices* of Δ. If Δ consists of all subsets of its vertex set, then it is called a *simplex*. The simplicial complex Δ can be associated with an ideal I_Δ of the polynomial ring $R = K[X]$, which is generated by all monomials whose support is not a face of Δ; I_Δ is called the

[1] MSC 2000: 13A15; 13F55, 14M10.
[2] Partially supported by the Italian Ministry of Education, University and Research.
[3] e-mail: barile@dm.uniba.it, Fax: 0039 080 596 3612

Stanley-Reisner ideal of Δ (over K). Its minimal monomial generators are the products of the elements of the minimal non-faces of Δ, and these are squarefree monomials. In fact, this construction provides a one-to-one correspondence between the simplicial complexes on X and the squarefree monomial ideals of $K[X]$. We briefly recall some basic facts about Stanley-Reisner ideals, for which we refer to the extensive treatment given in [9], Section 5.

The minimal primes of I_Δ are the ideals of the form

$$P_F = (X \setminus F), \qquad \text{where } F \text{ is any maximal face of } \Delta.$$

It follows that the height of I_Δ is equal to $|X| - max_{F\in\Delta}|F|$. The number $d = max_{F\in\Delta}|F| - 1$ is called the *dimension* of Δ; it is evidently equal to $\dim K[X]/I_\Delta - 1$. The ideal I_Δ is unmixed if and only if all maximal faces of Δ have the same cardinality: we then say that Δ is *pure*. Note that the maximal faces of a pure one-dimensional simplicial complex Δ form a graph; in general, the nonempty faces of a simplicial complex form a hypergraph, which we will use to represent Δ pictorially.

If I_Δ is a set-theoretic complete intersection, then one can prove that it is Cohen-Macaulay, from which one concludes that it is unmixed, i.e., Δ is pure. If I_Δ is Cohen-Macaulay for any field K, then we will call Δ a *Cohen-Macaulay simplicial complex*. According to a well-known geometric characterization, a pure one-dimensional simplicial complex is Cohen-Macaulay if and only if the associated graph is connected.

It is not known whether the Stanley-Reisner ideal of every Cohen-Macaulay simplicial complex is a set-theoretic complete intersection. The question is unsolved in general even for the special class of one-dimensional Gorenstein simplicial complexes, whose associated graphs are the cycle graphs C_n for $n \geq 1$. The answer is (trivially) affirmative for $n = 1, 2, 3, 4$, since in all these cases I_Δ is a complete intersection. In [8] we established that the answer is also affirmative for $n = 5$, which we deduced from a general criterion based on the divisibility relations between the products of monomial generators. This criterion, indeed, enabled us to prove the set-theoretic complete intersection property for various one-dimensional pure simplicial complexes but, as we observed, it does not solve the problem for $n = 6$. In this paper we will settle this case by a different approach: we will perform a direct computation which explicitly involves Cramer's Rule. Vanishing of determinants and proportionality conditions between rows of matrices are also applied to give a characteristic-free treatment of another example from [8].

Knowing that a certain Stanley-Reisner ideal is a set-theoretic complete intersection is not only interesting for itself: in our main result we will show how this allows us to determine the arithmetical rank of various other related Stanley-Reisner ideals, whose simplicial complexes are derived from the original one through a simple geometric construction.

The arithmetical rank of squarefree monomial ideals has also been intensively investigated by Lyubeznik ([11], [12]) and Terai et al. ([10], [15], [16]).

We recall the following result due to by Schmitt and Vogel, which will be useful in our proofs.

Lemma 1 (see [14], p. 249). *Let P be a finite subset of elements of R. Let $P_0, \ldots, P_r$ be subsets of P such that*

(i) $\bigcup_{l=0}^{r} P_l = P$;

(ii) P_0 *has exactly one element;*

(iii) if p and p'' are different elements of P_l $(0 < l \leq r)$ there is an integer l' with $0 \leq l' < l$ and an element $p' \in P_{l'}$ such that $pp'' \in (p')$.

Let $0 \leq l \leq r$, and, for any $p \in P_l$, let $e(p) \geq 1$ be an integer. We set $q_l = \sum_{p \in P_l} p^{e(p)}$. We will write (P) for the ideal of R generated by the elements of P. Then we get

$$\sqrt{(P)} = \sqrt{(q_0, \ldots, q_r)}.$$

1 The main theorem

Without loss of generality, we shall throughout assume that the field K is algebraically closed.
We will consider the following two sets of vertices/indeterminates over K: $X = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$ and $X' = X \cup \{x_0\}$. We set $R = K[X]$ and $R' = K[X']$.

Definition 1 Let F be any nonempty subset of X. We will call *cone from x_0 over F*, denoted $\operatorname{co}_{x_0} F$, the simplex on the vertex set $F \cup \{x_0\}$.

Let Δ be a simplicial complex on the vertex set X, and let F be any maximal face of Δ. Then $\Delta' = \Delta \cup \operatorname{co}_{x_0} F$ is a simplicial complex on the vertex set X'. As an immediate consequence of Definition 1 we have the following

Proposition 1 *The maximal faces of Δ' are the maximal faces $G \neq F$ of Δ and $F \cup \{x_0\}$. Correspondingly, the minimal primes of $I_{\Delta'}$ are the ideals $P_G + (x_0)$ and P_F.*

We are now ready to state our main result, which shows a relation between the arithmetical ranks of the ideal I_Δ of R and of the ideal $I_{\Delta'}$ of R'.

Theorem 1 *Suppose that I_Δ is a set-theoretic complete intersection. Then*

$$\operatorname{ara} I_{\Delta'} = \operatorname{ara} I_\Delta + 1.$$

Proof .-Let $t = \operatorname{height} I_\Delta$. Since I_Δ is unmixed, we have that $P_F = (x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_t})$ for some (pairwise distinct) indices $i_1, \ldots, i_t$. We may assume that $i_j = j$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, t$. By assumption $t = \operatorname{ara} I_\Delta$, i.e., there are $q_1, \ldots, q_t \in R$ which generate I_Δ up to radical. We will use these elements to construct $t + 1$ elements of R' which generate $I_{\Delta'}$ up to radical. This will allow us to conclude that $\operatorname{ara} I_{\Delta'} \leq t + 1$. The opposite inequality will be proved right afterwards.

We set $J = (q_1, \ldots, q_t)$. For all indices $i = 1, \ldots, t$, we have that $q_i \in I_\Delta$, whence $q_i \in (x_1, \ldots, x_t)$, i.e., $q_i = \sum_{j=1}^{t} a_{ij} x_j$ for some $a_{ij} \in R$. Recall that a polynomial belongs to a given monomial ideal if and only if each of its monomial terms is divisible by some monomial generator of this ideal. Therefore, up to eliminating redundant terms, we may assume that

$$a_{ij} x_j \in I_\Delta \qquad \text{for all indices } i, j \in \{1, \ldots, t\}. \tag{1}$$

Consider the following ring homomorphism:

$$\phi : R \longrightarrow R$$

$$f(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \mapsto f(x_1^2, \ldots, x_n^2),$$

and let $\bar{J} = \phi(J)$. We now show that

$$\sqrt{\bar{J}} = I_\Delta. \tag{2}$$

For all $i = 1, \ldots, t$, set $\bar{q}_i = \phi(q_i)$, so that

$$\bar{J} = (\bar{q}_1, \ldots, \bar{q}_t). \tag{3}$$

First of all note that, since all monomial terms of q_i belong to I_Δ, the same is true for all monomial terms of $\bar{q}_i$, because these are the squares of the monomial terms of q_i. Hence $\bar{J} \subset I_\Delta$, which implies that $\sqrt{\bar{J}} \subset I_\Delta$. Next we prove the opposite inclusion. Let g be any monomial generator of I_Δ. Since, by assumption, $\sqrt{J} = I_\Delta$, for some positive integer a we have that $g^a \in J$, i.e., there are $f_1, \ldots, f_t \in R$ such that $g^a = \sum_{i=1}^{t} f_i q_i$. But then

$$g^{2a} = \phi(g^a) = \sum_{i=1}^{t} \phi(f_i) \bar{q}_i,$$

which shows that $g \in \sqrt{\bar{J}}$. Thus $I_\Delta \subset \sqrt{\bar{J}}$, which completes the proof of (2). For all $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, t\}$, set $\bar{a}_{ij} = \phi(a_{ij}) x_j$, so that, for all $i = 1, \ldots, t$,

$$\bar{q}_i = \sum_{j=1}^{t} \bar{a}_{ij} x_j. \tag{4}$$

The monomial terms of every $\bar{a}_{ij}$ are all of the form $b^2 x_j$, where b is a monomial term of a_{ij}; hence, by (1), $b x_j \in I_\Delta$, so that $b^2 x_j \in I_\Delta$, and, for all $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, t\}$,

$$\bar{a}_{ij} \in I_\Delta, \qquad \text{whence} \qquad \bar{q}_i \in I_\Delta. \tag{5}$$

Let $\bar{A} = (\bar{a}_{ij})_{i,j=1,\ldots,t}$, and set $A' = \bar{A} + x_0 Id_t$, where Id_t denotes the $t \times t$ identity matrix. Moreover, let

$$D = \det A' - x_0^t. \tag{6}$$

Now, by definition of determinant, D is the sum of products each of which involves at least one entry of $\bar{A}$ as a factor; in view of (5), it follows that

$$D \in I_\Delta. \tag{7}$$

Set

$$J' = (D, \bar{q}_1 + x_0x_1, \ldots, \bar{q}_t + x_0x_t). \tag{8}$$

We claim that

$$\sqrt{J'} = I_{\Delta'}. \tag{9}$$

Note that, by definition of Stanley-Reisner ideal,

$$I_{\Delta'} = I_\Delta R' + (x_0x_1, \ldots, x_0x_t). \tag{10}$$

Now (5), (7), (8) and (10) imply that $J' \subset I_{\Delta'}$, so that $\sqrt{J'} \subset I_{\Delta'}$. For the opposite inclusion we use Hilbert's Nullstellensatz. Let $\mathbf{x} \in K^{n+1}$ be such that all elements of J' vanish at $\mathbf{x}$. We show that $\mathbf{x}$ annihilates all elements of $I_{\Delta'}$. In the rest of the proof, we shall identify each polynomial with its value at $\mathbf{x}$. Thus our assumption can be formulated in the form:

$$D = 0, \tag{11}$$

$$\bar{q}_1 + x_0x_1 = \cdots = \bar{q}_t + x_0x_t = 0. \tag{12}$$

We distinguish between two cases. First suppose that $\det A' \neq 0$. Note that A' is the matrix of coefficients of the square system of homogeneous linear equations

$$\sum_{i=1}^{t} (\bar{a}_{ij} + \delta_{ij}x_0)y_j = 0 \qquad (j = 1, \ldots, t)$$

in the unknowns $y_1, \ldots, y_t$. By Cramer's Rule it only has the trivial solution. Therefore, in view of (4), (12) implies that $x_1 = \cdots = x_t = 0$. But, in view of (10), $I_{\Delta'} \subset (x_1, \ldots, x_t)$, so that $\mathbf{x}$ annihilates all elements of $I_{\Delta'}$. Now suppose that $\det A' = 0$. Then, in view of (6), from (11) we deduce that $x_0 = 0$, so that from (12) we further have that $\bar{q}_1 = \cdots = \bar{q}_t = 0$. These equalities, together with (2) and (3), imply that all elements of I_Δ vanish at $\mathbf{x}$. In view of (10), we again conclude that $\mathbf{x}$ annihilates all elements of $I_{\Delta'}$. This completes the proof of (9). From (9) we deduce that $\operatorname{ara} I_{\Delta'} \leq t + 1$, as required. On the other hand, we have that $\operatorname{ara} I_{\Delta'}$ is greater than or equal to the height of all minimal primes of $I_{\Delta'}$: this is a consequence of Krull's Principal Ideal Theorem (see [13], Theorem 13.5). In view of Proposition 1 we thus conclude that $\operatorname{ara} I_{\Delta'} \geq t + 1$. Hence $\operatorname{ara} I_{\Delta'} = t + 1$, as was to be shown, and $D, \bar{q}_1 + x_0x_1, \ldots, \bar{q}_t + x_0x_t$ are $t + 1$ elements of R' generating $I_{\Delta'}$ up to radical. This completes the proof.

Example 1 Consider the simplicial complex Δ on the vertex set $\{x_1, \ldots, x_5\}$ whose maximal faces are $F = \{x_1, x_2\}$, $\{x_2, x_3\}$, $\{x_3, x_4\}$, $\{x_4, x_5\}$, $\{x_5, x_1\}$. It

is associated with the cycle graph C_5. Its (Gorenstein) Stanley-Reisner ideal in the polynomial ring $R = K[x_1, \ldots, x_5]$ is

$$I_\Delta = (x_1x_3,\ x_1x_4,\ x_2x_4,\ x_2x_5,\ x_3x_5),$$

whose minimal prime decomposition is

$$I = (x_3, x_4, x_5) \cap (x_1, x_4, x_5) \cap (x_1, x_2, x_3) \cap (x_2, x_3, x_4) \cap (x_1, x_2, x_5).$$

In [8], Example 1, we proved that it is a set-theoretic complete intersection, by showing that it is generated, up to radical, by the following three elements:

$$q_1 = x_1x_3,\ q_2 = x_1x_4 + x_2x_5,\ q_3 = x_2x_4 + x_3x_5. \tag{13}$$

According to Proposition 1, the corresponding simplicial complex $\Delta' = \Delta \cup \mathrm{co}_{x_0}F$ on the vertex set $\{x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_5\}$ has the following maximal faces: $\mathrm{co}_{x_0}F = \{x_1, x_2, x_0\}$, $\{x_2, x_3\}$, $\{x_3, x_4\}$, $\{x_4, x_5\}$, $\{x_5, x_1\}$. The monomial generators of $I_{\Delta'}$ are:

$$x_1x_3, x_1x_4, x_2x_4, x_2x_5, x_3x_5, x_0x_3, x_0x_4, x_0x_5.$$

According to Theorem 1, $\mathrm{ara}\, I_{\Delta'} = 4$; we construct four elements generating $I_{\Delta'} = 4$ up to radical applying the procedure described in the proof of the theorem to the elements q_1, q_2, q_3 presented in (13). With respect to the notation introduced above, we have that $P_F = (x_3, x_4, x_5)$ (i.e., in the proof of Theorem 1, $i_1 = 3$, $i_2 = 4$, $i_3 = 5$), and the matrix $(a_{ij})_{i,j=1,\ldots,3}$ is

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & x_1 & x_2 \\ 0 & x_2 & x_3 \end{pmatrix},$$

from which we derive the matrix

$$\bar{A} = \begin{pmatrix} x_1^2x_3 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & x_1^2x_4 & x_2^2x_5 \\ 0 & x_2^2x_4 & x_3^2x_5 \end{pmatrix}$$

and finally, the matrix

$$A' = \bar{A} + x_0Id_3 = \begin{pmatrix} x_1^2x_3 + x_0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & x_1^2x_4 + x_0 & x_2^2x_5 \\ 0 & x_2^2x_4 & x_3^2x_5 + x_0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

It follows that $I_{\Delta'}$ is generated up to radical by the following four elements:

$$\begin{aligned} &D = \det A' - x_0^3 = x_1^4x_3^3x_4x_5 + x_0x_1^2x_3^2x_4x_5 + x_0x_1^2x_3^3x_5 + x_0^2x_3^2x_5 \\ &\qquad\qquad + x_0x_1^4x_3x_4 + x_0^2x_1^2x_4 + x_0^2x_1^2x_3 - x_1^2x_2^4x_3x_4x_5 - x_0x_2^4x_4x_5, \\ &x_1^2x_3^2 + x_0x_3, \\ &x_1^2x_4^2 + x_2^2x_5^2 + x_0x_4, \\ &x_2^2x_4^2 + x_3^2x_5^2 + x_0x_5. \end{aligned}$$

2 More examples of computations of arithmetical ranks via linear algebra

In this section we present a class of squarefree monomial ideals whose arithmetical ranks can be determined using determinants and Cramer's Rule.

For all integers $n \geq 6$ let I_n be the ideal of $R = K[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ generated by the following squarefree monomials:

$$\begin{aligned} &x_1x_3, \ldots, x_1x_{n-1}, \\ &x_2x_4, \ldots, x_2x_n, \\ &x_3x_5, \ldots, x_3x_n, \\ &x_4x_n, \ldots, x_{n-2}x_n. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Our aim is to determine the arithmetical rank of I_n and to give $\operatorname{ara} I_n$ elements of R generating I_n up to radical. To this end we introduce the matrix $B = (b_{ij})_{i,j=1,\ldots,n-3}$ whose entries are defined as follows.

I.

(i) $b_{jj} = x_1$ for $j = 1, \ldots, n-4$;
(ii) $b_{n-3,n-3} = x_3$.

(All elements on the main diagonal are equal to x_1, except the last one, which is x_3.)

II. $b_{j+1,j} = x_2$ for $j = 1, \ldots, n-4$.
(All elements on the first "under-diagonal" are equal to x_2.)

III. $b_{ij} = 0$ if $i \geq j+2$.
(All elements below the first "under-diagonal" are equal to 0.)

IV. $b_{j-1,j} = x_3x_{3+j}$ for $j = 2, \ldots, n-4$.
(The elements on the first "over-diagonal", except the last one, are equal to $x_3x_5, \ldots, x_3x_{n-1}$, respectively.)

V.

(i) $b_{1,n-3} = x_2$;
(ii) $b_{i,n-3} = x_{2+i}$ for $i = 2, \ldots, n-4$.

(The first element of the last column is x_2, the following ones, except the last one, are x_4, ..., x_{n-2}, respectively.)

VI. $b_{ij} = 0$ if $j \geq i+2$ and $j \neq n-3$.
(All elements above the first "over-diagonal", except those in the last column, are equal to 0.)

Hence

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & x_3x_5 & & & & & x_2 \\ x_2 & x_1 & x_3x_6 & & & & x_4 \\ & x_2 & x_1 & \ddots & & & x_5 \\ & & x_2 & \ddots & \ddots & & \vdots \\ & & & \ddots & \ddots & x_3x_{n-1} & \vdots \\ & & & & \ddots & x_1 & x_{n-2} \\ & & & & & x_2 & x_3 \end{pmatrix},$$

where it is understood that the empty triangular regions are occupied by zeros. Set

$$D = \det B - (-1)^n x_2^{n-3}. \tag{15}$$

Lemma 2 *The following hold:*

(a) $D \in I_n$*;*

(b) $D - x_1^{n-4}x_3 \in x_2(x_4, \ldots, x_n)$.

Proof .-Let p be a nonzero term in the Laplace expansion of $\det B$ with respect to the first columun of B. According to the above prescriptions I.(i), II., and III., the only nonzero entries of the first column of B are $b_{11} = x_1$ and $b_{21} = x_2$. Hence p is the product of factors obtained by picking x_1 or x_2 in the first column and one entry in each of the columns of the submatrix of B obtained by omitting the first row and the first column, or the second row and the first column, respectively.

For the proof of (a), we show that one of the terms p is $(-1)^n x_2^{n-3}$, whereas the others are all divisible by some of the generators of I_n listed in (14). First suppose that x_1 is the entry picked in the first column. Then the entry picked in the $(n-3)$-th column is one of $b_{2,n-3} = x_4, \ldots, b_{n-4,n-3} = x_{n-2}$, $b_{n-3,n-3} = x_3$. Hence p is divisible by one of the following generators of I_n: $x_1x_4, \ldots, x_1x_{n-2}, x_1x_3$, as required. Now suppose that x_2 is the entry picked in the first column. Also assume that $b_{j+1,j} = x_2$ is the entry picked in all columns with the indices $j = 1, \ldots, k$, for some k such that $1 \leq k \leq n-4$. Suppose that k is maximal with respect to these conditions. If $k = n-4$, then the entry picked in the $(n-3)$-th column is $b_{1,n-3} = x_2$, and then $p = (-1)^n x_2^{n-3}$. So suppose that $k < n-4$. Then the entry picked in the $(k+1)$-th column is $b_{i,k+1}$, with $k+1 \neq n-3$, for some $i \notin \{2, \ldots, k+1\}$; by maximality of k, it cannot be $b_{k+2,k+1} = x_2$. Moreover, for all $i \geq k+3$, by III. we have that $b_{i,k+1} = 0$. Thus the entry picked in the $(k+1)$-th column is $b_{1,k+1}$, which, in view of I.(i), IV. and VI., is nonzero only for $k = 1$. Hence this entry is $b_{12} = x_3x_5$. Therefore, p is divisible by x_3x_5, which is one of the generators of I_n. This completes the proof of (a).

We now prove (b). We first show that if x_2 divides $p \neq (-1)^n x_2^{n-3}$, then one

of $x_4, \ldots, x_n$ divides p. We have seen in the last part of the proof of (a) that x_5 divides p whenever p is obtained by picking $b_{21} = x_2$ in the first column. So assume that p is divisible by x_2 and $b_{11} = x_1$ is the entry picked in the first column. Then $x_2 = b_{j+1,j}$ is the entry picked in the j-th column for some $j \in \{2, \ldots, n-4\}$. Let j be minimal with respect to this property. Then the entry picked in the j-th row is not $b_{j,j-1} = x_2$ (by minimality), nor $b_{jj} = x_1$, which lies in the j-th column. Hence, discarding zero entries, this entry is necessarily $b_{j,j+1} = x_3x_{4+j}$ if $j \neq n-4$ or $b_{n-4,n-3} = x_{n-2}$ if $j = n-4$. But then x_{3+j} or x_{n-2} divides p, as required. There remains to show that, if p is not divisible by x_2, then $p = x_1^{n-4}x_3$. So assume that p is not divisible by x_2. Then it has been obtained by picking x_1 in the first column. Suppose that $b_{jj} = x_1$ is the entry picked in all the columns with the indices $j = 1, \ldots, k$, for some k such that $1 \leq k \leq n-4$. Then the entry picked in the $(k+1)$-th column is $b_{i,k+1}$ for some $i \notin \{1, \ldots, k\}$, and it cannot be $b_{k+2,k+1} = x_2$. According to III., the only nonzero available entry is then $b_{k+1,k+1}$. This shows by finite induction that $p = \prod_{j=1}^{n-3} b_{jj} = x_1^{n-4}x_3$, as required. This completes the proof of (b), and of the Lemma.

Let

$$q_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n-3} b_{ij}x_{3+j} \qquad \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, n-3. \tag{16}$$

We can now prove the following result.

Proposition 2 *For all integers $n \geq 6$,*

$$I_n = \sqrt{(D, q_1, \ldots, q_{n-3})}.$$

Proof .-Set $J = (D, q_1, \ldots, q_{n-3})$. For all $i, j = 1 \ldots, n-3$ set $s_{ij} = b_{ij}x_{3+j}$. We first show that the s_{ij}'s (i.e., the summands of the q_i's) are, up to repeated factors, the generators of I_n listed in (14), with the only exception of x_1x_3. In fact these terms s_{ij} are:

$$\begin{aligned}
s_{14} &= b_{11}x_4 = x_1x_4, \ldots, s_{n-4,n-4} = b_{n-4,n-4}x_{n-1} = x_1x_{n-1}, && \text{(see I.(i))}\\
s_{21} &= b_{21}x_4 = x_2x_4, \ldots, s_{n-3,n-4} = b_{n-3,n-4}x_{n-1} = x_2x_{n-1}, && \text{(see II.)}\\
&\qquad\qquad s_{1,n-3} = b_{1,n-3}x_n = x_2x_n, && \text{(see V.(i))}\\
s_{12} &= b_{12}x_5 = x_3x_5^2 \ldots, s_{n-5,n-4} = b_{n-5,n-4}x_{n-1} = x_3x_{n-1}^2, && \text{(see IV.)}\\
&\qquad\qquad s_{n-3,n-3} = b_{n-3,n-3}x_n = x_3x_n, && \text{(see I.(ii))}\\
s_{2,n-3} &= b_{2,n-3}x_n = x_4x_n, \ldots, s_{n-4,n-3} = b_{n-4,n-3}x_n = x_{n-2}x_n. && \text{(see V.(ii))}
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that $q_1, \ldots, q_{n-3} \in I_n$. In view of Lemma 2(a) this implies that $J \subset I_n$, whence $\sqrt{J} \subset I_n$.
For the proof of the opposite inclusion we use Hilbert's Nullstellensatz. Let $\mathbf{x} \in K^n$ be such that $D, q_1, \ldots, q_{n-3}$ vanish at $\mathbf{x}$. We show that $\mathbf{x}$ annihilates all generators of I_n listed in (14). In the rest of the proof, unless otherwise

indicated, we shall identify every polynomial with its value at $\mathbf{x}$. Hence our assumption can be stated as follows:

$$D = 0, \tag{17}$$

$$q_1 = \cdots = q_{n-3} = 0. \tag{18}$$

We distinguish between two cases. First assume that $\det B \neq 0$. Note that B is the matrix of the coefficients of the square system of homogeneous linear equations

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n-3} b_{ij} y_j = 0 \qquad (i = 1, \ldots, n-3)$$

in the unknowns $y_1, \ldots, y_{n-3}$. By Cramer's Rule it follows that it only has the trivial solution. Hence, in view of (16), (18) implies that $x_4 = \cdots = x_n = 0$. This, together with Lemma 2(b), gives $D - x_1^{n-4} x_3 = 0$. From (17) it then follows that $x_1 x_3 = 0$. Thus all generators of I_n listed in (14) vanish at $\mathbf{x}$. Now assume that $\det B = 0$. By (15) and (17) we then have $D = x_2 = 0$, which, in view of Lemma 2(b), yields $x_1 x_3 = 0$. There remains to prove that the monomials

$$x_1 x_4, \ldots, x_1 x_{n-1}, x_3 x_5, \ldots, x_3 x_n, x_4 x_n, \ldots, x_{n-2} x_n \tag{19}$$

vanish at $\mathbf{x}$ as well. For all $i = 1, \ldots, n-3$, let $\tilde{q}_i$ be the polynomial of R obtained by setting $x_2 = 0$ in q_i. From the first part of the proof we know that the nonzero summands s_{ij} of the $\tilde{q}_i$'s are, up to repeated factors, the monomials listed in (19). Hence it suffices to show that Lemma 1 can be applied to the following sequence of polynomials

$$p = x_1 x_3, p_0 = \tilde{q}_{n-3} = x_3 x_n, p_1 = \tilde{q}_1, \ldots, p_{n-4} = \tilde{q}_{n-4}.$$

We show that, for all $i = 1, \ldots, n-4$, the product of any two nonzero terms s_{ij}, s_{ik} of $\tilde{q}_i$ is divisible by $x_1 x_3$ or $x_3 x_n$ or some term $s_{i'j}$ with $1 \leq i' < i$. For $i = 1$ the only product to be considered is

$$s_{11} s_{12} = b_{11} x_4 b_{12} x_5 = x_1 x_4 x_3 x_5^2,$$

which is divisible by $x_1 x_3$. For $i \in \{2, \ldots, n-4\}$ we have to consider three different kinds of products (in the first and last we assume that $i \neq n-4$):

$$\begin{aligned}
s_{ii} s_{i,i+1} &= b_{ii} x_{3+i} b_{i,i+1} x_{4+i} = x_1 x_{3+i} x_3 x_{4+i}^2, \text{ which is divisible by } x_1 x_3, \\
s_{ii} s_{i,n-3} &= b_{ii} x_{3+i} b_{i,n-3} x_n = x_1 x_{3+i} x_{2+i} x_n, \\
&\qquad \text{which is divisible by } s_{i-1,i-1} = b_{i-1,i-1} x_{3+i-1} = x_1 x_{2+i}, \\
s_{i,i+1} s_{i,n-3} &= b_{i,i+1} x_{4+i} b_{i,n-3} x_n = x_3 x_{4+i}^2 x_{2+i} x_n, \text{ which is divisible by } x_3 x_n.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.

Corollary 1 *For all integers $n \geq 6$,*

$$\operatorname{ara} I_n = n - 2.$$

Proof .-From Proposition 2 we have that $\operatorname{ara} I \leq n-2$. On the other hand, in view of (14), $P = (x_1, \ldots, x_{n-2})$ is a minimal prime of I_n. Hence by [13], Theorem 13.5, $n-2 \leq \operatorname{ara} I_n$. This completes the proof.

Example 2 The ideal I_6 of $K[x_1, \ldots, x_6]$ is generated by the following squarefree monomials:

$$\begin{aligned} &x_1x_3, x_1x_4, x_1x_5,\\ &x_2x_4, x_2x_5, x_2x_6,\\ &x_3x_5, x_3x_6,\\ &x_4x_6. \end{aligned}$$

According to Proposition 2 it is generated up to radical by the following four elements:

$$\begin{aligned} D &= x_1^2x_3 - x_1x_2x_4 - x_2x_3^2x_5,\\ q_1 &= x_1x_4 + x_3x_5^2 + x_2x_6,\\ q_2 &= x_2x_4 + x_1x_5 + x_4x_6,\\ q_3 &= x_2x_5 + x_3x_6. \end{aligned}$$

Note that I_6 is the Stanley-Reisner ideal of the (Gorenstein) simplicial complex on the vertex set $\{x_1, \ldots, x_6\}$ whose maximal faces are $\{x_1, x_2\}$, $\{x_2, x_3\}$, $\{x_3, x_4\}$, $\{x_4, x_5\}$, $\{x_5, x_6\}$, $\{x_6, x_1\}$. It is associated with the cycle graph C_6. The question, raised by Marcel Morales, whether the Stanley-Reisner rings of the Gorenstein simplicial complexes associated with the cycle graphs C_n are all set-theoretic complete intersections remains open; in fact our method cannot allow us to settle the problem for $n \geq 7$.

Example 3 Consider the ideal I_7 of $K[x_1, \ldots, x_7]$, which is generated by the following squarefree monomials:

$$\begin{aligned} &x_1x_3, x_1x_4, x_1x_5, x_1x_6,\\ &x_2x_4, x_2x_5, x_2x_6, x_2x_7,\\ &x_3x_5, x_3x_6, x_3x_7,\\ &x_4x_7, x_5x_7. \end{aligned}$$

According to Corollary 1, $\operatorname{ara} I_7 = 5$ and, by Proposition 2, I_7 it is generated up to radical by the following five elements:

$$\begin{aligned} D &= x_1^3x_3 - x_1^2x_2x_5 - x_1x_2x_3^2x_6 + x_1x_2^2x_4 - x_1x_2x_3^2x_5 + x_2^2x_3x_5^2,\\ q_1 &= x_1x_4 + x_3x_5^2 + x_2x_7,\\ q_2 &= x_2x_4 + x_1x_5 + x_3x_6^2 + x_4x_7,\\ q_3 &= x_2x_5 + x_1x_6 + x_5x_7,\\ q_4 &= x_2x_6 + x_3x_7. \end{aligned}$$

Note that I_7 is the Stanley-Reisner ideal of the simplicial complex on the vertex set $\{x_1, \ldots, x_7\}$ whose maximal faces are $\{x_1, x_2\}$, $\{x_2, x_3\}$, $\{x_3, x_4\}$, $\{x_4, x_5, x_6\}$, $\{x_6, x_7\}$, $\{x_7, x_1\}$.

We now complete the statement contained in Corollary 1.

Corollary 2 *The ideal I_n is a set-theoretic complete intersection if and only if $n = 6$.*

Proof .-Since, in view of (14), both $P = (x_1, \ldots, x_{n-2})$ and $Q = (x_1, x_2, x_3, x_n)$ are minimal primes of I_n, I_n is not unmixed if $n > 6$, hence it is not a set-theoretic complete intersection. In view of Example 2, this completes the proof.

Remark 1 Note that, up to renaming vertices, the simplicial complex in Example 3 can be obtained from the one in Example 2 by the cone construction described in Section 1. In particular, five elements generating I_7 up to radical can also be obtained from the four elements generating I_6 up to radical by means of Theorem 1.

3 One more set-theoretic complete intersection via linear algebra

Next we present an example of Stanley-Reisner ideal whose set-theoretic complete intersection property can be shown by arguments which, in addition to Cramer's Rule, involve considerations on the proportionality between rows of a matrix.

Example 4 In the polynomial ring $R = K[x_1, \ldots, x_6]$ consider the ideal I generated by the following squarefree monomials:

$$x_1x_4, x_1x_5, x_1x_2x_3, x_2x_4, x_2x_5, x_2x_6, x_3x_5, x_3x_6, x_4x_6. \tag{20}$$

It is the Stanley-Reisner ideal of the Cohen-Macaulay simplicial complex on the vertex set $\{x_1, \ldots, x_6\}$ whose maximal faces are $\{x_1, x_2\}$, $\{x_2, x_3\}$, $\{x_1, x_3\}$, $\{x_3, x_4\}$, $\{x_4, x_5\}$, $\{x_5, x_6\}$, $\{x_6, x_1\}$. The ideal I is unmixed of height 4. Set

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & x_3 \\ x_2 & x_3 & x_4 \\ 0 & x_1 & x_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

so that

$$\det C = 2x_1x_2x_3 - x_1^2x_4 - x_2^3. \tag{21}$$

We show that I is generated, up to radical, by the following four elements:

$$\begin{aligned} D = \det C - x_1x_2x_3 + x_2^3 &= x_1x_2x_3 - x_1^2x_4, \\ q_1 &= x_1x_4 + x_2x_5 + x_3x_6, \\ q_2 &= x_2x_4 + x_3x_5 + x_4x_6, \\ q_3 &= x_1x_5 + x_2x_6. \end{aligned}$$

Since these all belong to I, it suffices to show that whenever $\mathbf{x} \in K^6$ annihilates them all, $\mathbf{x}$ annihilates all monomial generators of I, which are listed in (20), as well. As usual, from now on we will identify all polynomials with their value at $\mathbf{x}$. So assume that

$$\begin{aligned} x_1x_2x_3 - x_1^2x_4 &= 0, && (22)\\ x_1x_4 + x_2x_5 + x_3x_6 &= 0, && (23)\\ x_2x_4 + x_3x_5 + x_4x_6 &= 0, && (24)\\ x_1x_5 + x_2x_6 &= 0. && (25) \end{aligned}$$

Note that C is the matrix of coefficients of the square system of homogeneous linear equations

$$\begin{aligned} x_1y_1 + x_2y_2 + x_3y_3 &= 0,\\ x_2y_1 + x_3y_2 + x_4y_3 &= 0,\\ x_1y_2 + x_2y_3 &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

in the unknowns y_1, y_2, y_3. We distinguish between several cases and subcases.

Case 1: Suppose that $\det C \neq 0$. Then, by Cramer's Rule, the above system of linear equations only has the trivial solution. Thus equalities (23), (24) and (25), imply that $x_4 = x_5 = x_6$. From (22) it then follows that $x_1x_2x_3 = 0$. Hence all generators listed in (20) vanish at $\mathbf{x}$ in this case.

Case 2: Suppose that $\det C = 0$. Then (21) and (22) imply

$$0 = x_1x_2x_3 - x_2^3 = x_2(x_1x_3 - x_2^2).$$

Hence $x_2 = 0$ or $x_1x_3 - x_2^2 = 0$.

Case 2.1: Suppose that $x_2 = 0$, so that $x_1x_2x_3 = x_2x_4 = x_2x_5 = x_2x_6 = 0$. Hence, from (25) we get $x_1x_5 = 0$. Moreover, from (22) we obtain $x_1x_4 = 0$, so that, by (23), we also have that $x_3x_6 = 0$. Now the only surviving summands in (24) are x_3x_5 and x_4x_6. Since x_3x_6 divides their product, by Lemma 1 it follows that $x_3x_5 = x_4x_6 = 0$. Thus all generators listed in (20) vanish at $\mathbf{x}$.

Case 2.2: Suppose that $x_2 \neq 0$, so that $x_1x_3 - x_2^2 = 0$. Then the rows of the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_1 & x_2 \\ x_2 & x_3 \end{pmatrix}$$

are proportional.

Case 2.2.1: Suppose that one of the rows of the above matrix is zero. Then $x_2 = 0$, so that $x_1x_2x_3 = x_2x_4 = x_2x_5 = x_2x_6 = 0$. Hence from (22) we have that $x_1x_4 = 0$ and from (25) we have that $x_1x_5 = 0$. From (23) we then get $x_3x_6 = 0$. Since x_3x_6 divides the product of x_3x_5 and x_4x_6, which are the summands surviving in (24), it follows that $x_3x_5 = x_4x_6 = 0$. Thus all generators listed in (20) vanish at $\mathbf{x}$. Now suppose that $x_3 = 0$, so that $x_3x_5 = x_3x_6 = 0$. Then from (24) we get $x_4x_6 = 0$, and from (25) we get $x_1x_5 = 0$. Thus all generators listed in (20) vanish at $\mathbf{x}$.

Case 2.2.2: Suppose that none of the rows of the above matrix is zero. Then there is a nonzero $\lambda \in K$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 &= \lambda x_2 = \lambda^2 x_3, \\ x_2 &= \lambda x_3. \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Replacing these equalities in (23) and (24) gives

$$\lambda^2 x_3 x_4 + \lambda x_3 x_5 + x_3 x_6 = 0 \tag{27}$$

$$\lambda x_3 x_4 + x_3 x_5 + x_4 x_6 = 0 \tag{28}$$

Comparing (27) with λ(28) further yields:

$$x_3 x_6 = \lambda x_4 x_6. \tag{29}$$

Case 2.2.2.1: Suppose that $x_6 = 0$, so that $x_2 x_6 = x_3 x_6 = x_4 x_6 = 0$. Then from (25) we get $x_1 x_5 = 0$. Since $x_1 x_5$ divides the product of $x_1 x_4$ and $x_2 x_5$, which are the terms surviving in (23), we conclude that $x_1 x_4 = x_2 x_5 = 0$. From (22) we then get that $x_1 x_2 x_3 = 0$. Moreover, since $x_2 x_5$ divides the product of $x_2 x_4$ and $x_3 x_5$, which are the terms surviving in (24), we also conclude that $x_2 x_4 = x_3 x_5 = 0$. Thus all generators listed in (20) vanish at $\mathbf{x}$.

Case 2.2.2.2: Suppose that $x_6 \neq 0$. Then from (29) we get

$$x_3 = \lambda x_4, \tag{30}$$

which, together with (26), implies that

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 &= \lambda^3 x_4, \\ x_2 &= \lambda^2 x_4. \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

Replacing the equalities (31) in (25) gives

$$\lambda^3 x_4 x_5 + \lambda^2 x_4 x_6 = 0, \qquad \text{i.e.,} \qquad \lambda x_4 x_5 + x_4 x_6 = 0. \tag{32}$$

On the other hand, replacing (30) and (31) in (23) we have:

$$\lambda^3 x_4^2 + \lambda^2 x_4 x_5 + \lambda x_4 x_6 = 0,$$

so that, by (32),

$$\lambda^3 x_4^2 = 0, \qquad \text{i.e.,} \qquad x_4 = 0.$$

Thus, by (26) and (30), we have that $x_1 = x_2 = x_3 = 0$. Thus all generators listed in (20) vanish at $\mathbf{x}$.

We have examined all possible cases, hence our claim is proven.

Remark 2 Four elements generating the ideal I of Example 4 up to radical had already been found, by a different approach, in [8], Example 4. These elements, however, were strictly depending on the characteristic of K.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author is indebted to Marcel Morales for posing the question which motivated this paper.

References

[1] Barile, M., On the number of equations defining certain varieties, *Manuscr. Math.*, **91**, (1996), 483–494.

[2] Barile, M., On the computation of arithmetical ranks, *Int. J. Pure Appl. Math.*, **17**, (2004), 143–161.

[3] Barile, M., On ideals whose radical is a monomial ideal. *Comm. Algebra* **33**, (2005), 4479–4490.

[4] Barile, M., A note on monomial ideals, *Arch. Math. (Basel)*, **87**, (2006), 516–521.

[5] Barile, M., On the arithmetical of an intersection of ideals. Preprint (2006). math.AC/0605046. To appear in: *Algebra Colloq.*

[6] Barile, M., A note on the edge ideals of Ferrers graphs. Preprint (2006). math.AC/0606353.

[7] Barile, M., On the arithmetical rank of the edge ideals of forests. Preprint (2006). math.AC/0607306.

[8] Barile, M., On the arithmetical rank of certain monomial ideals. Preprint (2006). math.AC/0611790.

[9] Bruns, W.; Herzog, J., *Cohen-Macaulay Rings*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, 1993.

[10] Kimura, K; Terai, N.; Yoshida, K., Arithmetical rank of squarefree monomial ideals of small arithmetic degree. Preprint (2007).

[11] Lyubeznik, G., On the local cohomology modules $H^i_{\mathcal{A}}(R)$ for ideals $\mathcal{A}$ generated by monomials in an R-sequence. In: *Complete Intersections*, Lectures given at the 1$^{\text{st}}$ 1983 Session of the Centro Internazionale Matematico Estivo (C.I.M.E.), Acireale, Italy, June 13–21, 1983; Greco, S., Strano, R., Eds.; Springer: Berlin Heidelberg, 1984, 214–220.

[12] Lyubeznik, G., On the arithmetical rank of monomial ideals, *J. Algebra*, **112**, (1988), 86–89.

[13] Matsumura, H., *Commutative Ring Theory*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, 1986.

[14] Schmitt, Th.; Vogel, W., Note on set-theoretic intersections of subvarieties of projective space, *Math. Ann.*, **245**, (1979), 247–253.

[15] Terai, N., On almost complete intersection monomial ideals. In: *Dai 24 kai kakan-kanron sinpojiumu houkokushu (Proceedings of the 24th Commutative Algebra Symposium)*, Osaka, Japan, 142–150, 2002.

[16] Terai, N., Arithmetical rank of monomial ideals. In: *Dai 25 kai kakan-kanron sinpojiumu houkokushu (Proceedings of the 25th Commutative Algebra Symposium)* Tokyo, Japan, 99–105, 2003.